

**Letter of Findings: 65-20200096  
Indiana Overweight Proposed Assessment  
For the Year 2019**

**NOTICE:** IC § 6-8.1-3-3.5 and IC § 4-22-7-7 require the publication of this document in the Indiana Register. This document provides the general public with information about the Indiana Department of Revenue's (the "Department") official position concerning a specific set of facts and issues. This document is effective on its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register. The "Holding" section of this document is provided for the convenience of the reader and is not part of the analysis contained in this Letter of Findings.

### HOLDING

Motor Carrier did not provide sufficient evidence that it should not be assessed the full civil penalty for having multiple motor carrier violations.

### ISSUE

#### **I. Motor Vehicles - Overweight Penalty.**

**Authority:** IC § 6-8.1-5-1; IC § 6-8.1-1-1; IC § 9-20-1-1; IC § 9-20-1-2; IC § 9-20-4-1; IC § 9-20-6-11; IC § 9-20-18-14.5; *Indiana Dept. of State Revenue v. Rent-A-Center East, Inc.*, 963 N.E.2d 463 (Ind. 2012); *Lafayette Square Amoco, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 867 N.E.2d 289 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2007); *Dept. of State Revenue v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 15 N.E.3d 579 (Ind. 2014).

Taxpayer protests the proposed assessment.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

Taxpayer is a trucking company with vehicles that travel through Indiana. On March 8, 2019, the Indiana State Police ("ISP") reported Taxpayer's commercial motor vehicle for having multiple motor carrier violation. As a result, the Department issued Taxpayer a proposed assessment for violating their existing permit. Taxpayer protested the assessment of the civil penalties. The Department held an administrative hearing, and this Letter of Findings results. Further facts will be provided as necessary.

#### **I. Motor Vehicles - Overweight Penalty.**

### DISCUSSION

ISP reported that Taxpayer was in violation of an oversized permit regarding the statutorily allowed limits of dimensions, axel weight, and gross weight. Taxpayer was more than two feet over the statutorily allowed dimension. Additionally, Taxpayer was 48,000 pounds over the gross statutorily allowed limit. The stop occurred after Taxpayer's driver delivered a load and, unbeknownst to Taxpayer, took an excavator on the return trip.

As a threshold issue, it is Taxpayer's responsibility to establish that the existing proposed assessment is incorrect. As stated in IC § 6-8.1-5-1(c), "[t]he notice of proposed assessment is prima facie evidence that the [D]epartment's claim for the unpaid tax is valid. The burden of proving that the proposed assessment is wrong rests with the person against whom the proposed assessment is made." *Indiana Dept. of State Revenue v. Rent-A-Center East, Inc.*, 963 N.E.2d 463, 466 (Ind. 2012); *Lafayette Square Amoco, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 867 N.E.2d 289, 292 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2007).

The Department notes that, "[W]hen [courts] examine a statute that an agency is 'charged with enforcing. . . [courts] defer to the agency's reasonable interpretation of [the] statute even over an equally reasonable interpretation by another party.'" *Dept. of State Revenue v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 15 N.E.3d 579, 583 (Ind. 2014). Thus, all interpretations of Indiana tax law contained within this decision, as well as the preceding audit, shall be entitled to deference.

According to IC § 9-20-1-1, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided in [IC Art. 9-20], a person, including a transport operator, may not operate or move upon a highway a vehicle or combination of vehicles of a size or weight

exceeding the limitations provided in [IC Art. 9-20]."

According to IC § 9-20-1-2, the owner of a vehicle "may not cause or knowingly permit to be operated or moved upon a highway [in Indiana] a vehicle or combination of vehicles of a size or weight exceeding the limitations provided in [IC Art. 9-20]."

According to IC § 9-20-6-11(b), "[a] person may not violate the terms or conditions of a special permit."

IC § 9-20-18-14.5 authorizes the Department to impose civil penalties against Motor Carriers that obtain a permit under IC Art. 9-20 and violate IC Art. 9-20 ("Permit Violation Civil Penalty") or are required, but fail, to obtain a permit under IC Art. 9-20 ("No Permit Civil Penalty"). IC § 9-20-18-14.5(c) provides that a person "who transports vehicles or loads subject to this article and fails to obtain a permit required under this article is subject to a civil penalty . . ." According to IC § 9-20-18-14.5(b), the Department may subject a person to a civil penalty if the person "obtains a permit under" IC Art. 9-20 and violates IC Art. 9-20 by being overweight or oversize.

IC § 6-8.1-1-1 states that fees and penalties stemming from IC Art. 9-20 violations are a "listed tax." These listed taxes are in addition to and separate from any arrangement or agreement made with a local court or political subdivision regarding the traffic stop.

In this case, Taxpayer had an existing permit. According to the ISP report, Taxpayer transported an excavator that was more than the dimensions and weight amount allowed under IC § 9-20-4-1. Taxpayer concedes that the excavator was likely over dimensions and overweight.

The Department imposed civil penalties in accordance with IC § 9-20-18-14.5 because Taxpayer violated his preexisting permit. Taxpayer states that, while the vehicle was 48,000 pounds overweight and well passed the statutorily permitted dimensions, there was no intention to be and the reasons for being oversized and overweight was because Taxpayer was unaware of the driver's actions.

First, the Department notes that Taxpayer is required to have a permit for carrying loads that exceed statutory limits at the time of transport. This allows the Department to provide Taxpayer a route safe for transport. Second, IC § 9-20-18-14.5 provides that a civil penalty issued by the Department under IC Art. 9-20 is (1) in addition to and separate from any other civil penalties issued under Titles 8 and 9 and (2) in addition to any fines imposed by a court. In this case, Taxpayer violated its existing permit while transporting cargo; therefore, it is appropriate for Taxpayer to be assessed the proposed amount.

The Department understands Taxpayer's situation but because Taxpayer was fully aware of the permit requirement and was in such excess of dimensions and gross weight, the full penalty of the proposed assessment.

## FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is denied.

July 14, 2020

*Posted: 09/30/2020 by Legislative Services Agency*  
An [html](#) version of this document.